

Moreno Morani

THREE ARMENIAN ETYMOLOGIES

ԱՇՈՒՆ ASHUN 'AUTUMN'

About the etymology of *ashun* there is no agreement among scholars. Two ways have been principally attempted to find a convincing etymology of this word,¹ but they have not been brought to satisfactory conclusions. The first explanation, which was already rejected by Hübschmann in his Armenian grammar published in 1897,² connects *ashun* with some Germanic and Balto-Slavic words like Goth. *asans*,³ OH German. *aren*, OSl. *jesenĩ*, Russ. *osen*,⁴ OPruss. *assanis*⁵: if the explanation of Gr. *opōra* from **op-osarā* (lit. 'the season after the summer') is correct,⁶ we have to assume a heteroclite stem **es-er / es-en-* with an alternance **es- / os-* in the radical syllable⁷: to connect Arm. *ashun* with this root we must suppose an originary form **os-yon-*: in this case, since an evolution *o > a*, although rare, is possible, the main difficulty is represented by the development of **sy* into *sh*, a sound change for which we have no further example.

The second explanation, proposed by Scheftelowitz⁸ and accepted (with some reservations) by Solta⁹ and proceeding from **as-sky-ōn*, is no better, because *sh* is attested only as a result of **ks*, not of **sk*.¹⁰ The comparison with *gisher* 'evening' does not hold because the origin of this word is uncertain and there is no evidence for a derivation of *gisher* from **(we)sker-* or *(ghois)sker*,¹¹ and the etymology of *shiwgh* from **sk(h)ei-*, proposed by Pisani,¹² is unlikely for both semantical and phonetical reasons.¹³

Neither the first nor the second etymology is quoted by Walde-Pokorny and Pokorny in their etymological dictionaries of IE.¹⁴ However, Arm. *ashun* is quoted in the new *Indo-European Comparative Dictionary* by E. S. Mann, which assigns the Armenian, Germanic and Balto-Slavic words in the derivations from a root **asyōn* (*asin*, *asen*). But such a reconstruction of the IE root is unsuitable for a full explanation of all the quoted words; for instance, it would be difficult to understand why OSl. has *je-* in initial syllable from an IE **a*. Moreover, it is well known that the late Armenologist collected in his book many items about which a previous critical judgment of the value of the proposed etymologies is often inadequate or lacking.¹⁵

I believe that the origin of *ashun* is to be explored outside the Indo-European family, and in this paper I suggest a different etymology of the Armenian word. I would connect Arm. *ashun* with Lat. *autumnus*: in my opinion both words are borrowed from a common source, which might be individuated in the languages of the Mediterranean substratum. My view can be confirmed through both linguistic and anthropological reasons.

The borrowing of Lat. *autumnus* from a Mediterranean language is generally agreed.¹⁶ Even if a few Latin words with a suffix **-mno- / -mnā-* (for instance *columna*, *alumnus*) have a quite sure Indo-European origin, the same suffix **-mno* occurs in other words of foreign (Etruscan) origin like *Vertumnus*. In Greek, too, there are words without an Indo-European explanation terminating in *-mno*, *-mnā*.¹⁷

The difficulties in connecting the Latin and Armenian words are more apparent than real. From the phonetical point of view I submit the following considerations.

1. An alternance *au / a* in initial or unstressed syllable is found in forms or languages which are related to a Mediterranean substratum. In Etruscan the same word appears sometimes with *au*, sometimes with *a*¹⁸; Albanian and Messapian have the development *au > a*¹⁹; a word surely borrowed from substratum like Gr. *dáphnē* has a dialectal variety *daúkhnā*; the same alternance *au / a* is found in other word pairs of probable or sure origin from a substratum like Lat. *caupō* : Gr. *kapēlós*. In Vulgar Latin alternance *au / a* has a relevant importance: many classical words with *au* appear with *a* in vulgar inscriptions and texts²⁰ and the romance continuation of *ausculture*,²¹ *augustus*,²² *augurium*²³ definitively assumed *a*. The name of the town *Pisaurum* appears in classical texts with *au*, but its Italian continuation is *Pesaro* with *a*. For these grounds, if Arm. *ashun* is a borrowing from a substratum, an alternance *au / a* in the first syllable is quite acceptable: the Greek-Latin word pairs *kapēlós* : *caupō* or *dáphnē* : *laurus* have no different characters as does the Latin-Armenian pair *autumnus* : *ashun*.

2. Arm. *-un* may go back to an early **-omn-*, as *anun* 'name' goes back to **o-nomn-*. This derivation of *-un* in the substantives was suggested by Meillet and confirmed by Greppin.²⁴ Since *-wn* is the form assumed in Armenian by *-mn* only after the ancient *-o-*, it is probable that the suffix *-mn*, which occurs especially after *-u*, has the same origin as *-un*.²⁵ We have already remarked that some Greek and Latin nouns with a termination *-mno*, *-mnā* are probably borrowed from a substratum: it is possible to repeat the same consideration for Armenian too. In a word like *koghm* 'canton' the suffix is attached to a form *kogh*, for which there is no evidence for an Indo-European origin.

If the connection, suggested by Laroche,²⁶ between Arm. *himn* 'foundation' and Hitt. *samana-* is correct, it seems at least possible that these words are borrowed from a substratum language, because the meanings of the two IE roots **sē(i)* quoted by Pokorny²⁷ are semantically too far apart ('to sow' or 'to riddle'). The probable connection between Arm. *geghmn* 'fleece' and Lat. *vellus* (< **welno-* < **welmino-*?) may be referred to a substratum source: the word formation is unclear, a derivation from the same root of Lat. *lāna*, Goth. *wulls* etc. is doubtful, the hypothesis of a relation with *uellere* and its group remains uncertain and it may be attributable to a popular etymology, and I would point out the ancient vowel alternance *e/i* in the pair *uellus* : *uillus*, which can be viewed as a factor in favor of the origin from a substratum.²⁸ In this case, we might have a second pair of an Armenian and a Latin word deriving from a substratum, exactly like *ashun* and *autumnus*.

3. The only remaining phonetical difficulty in the connection *autumnus* : *ashun* is represented by the apparently anomalous correspondence between *-t-* and *-sh-*. In my opinion it is possible to find an explanation to overcome this difficulty too. Since phonological systems of the non-Indo-European languages of the substratum were probably very different from the systems of the Indo-European ones, the representation of foreign sounds in the borrowed words was naturally approximated. We have to suppose in the common source a phoneme as [ɸ]: the existence of interdental spirant phonemes in the Mediterranean languages is supported by examples like Lat. *falx*, Gr. *Zágklē* or *Dágklē* < **ǵalki-* or Lat. *ficus*, Gr. *sýkon*, Boeot. *týkon* < **ɸík-*, *ɸūk-*. In Latin [ɸ] [ɸ̌] become regularly *f-* in the beginning and *-t-*, *-d-* in the middle of a word, exactly like secondary [ɸ] [ɸ̌] from **th*, *dh* in the forms inherited from IE.²⁹ The history of these sounds in Armenian is not clear, and in a word surely borrowed from a substratum like *t'uz* 'fig' (connected with *ficus* etc.), a *t'* seems to be the continuation of an early [ɸ]. In his book *Geschichte der armenischen Philologie*, where he accepted the theory of the Basko-Caucasic substratum and examined with many personal contributions the relationship of Armenian with it, J. Karst suggests among other connections, sometimes unsure or absolutely improbable, the following one, which is, in my opinion, quite probable³⁰: Arm. *orosh* 'other, foreign' : Bask. *arrotz* 'a foreigner, a guest'; in this case too we have to reconstruct a phoneme [ɸ] in the source (something like **(a)-roɸ-*?).

In short we can assume an originary form like **a(u)ɸumno-*, which seems to be suitable from a linguistical point of view for a good explanation for both *autumnus* and *ashun*. But I can reinforce my view through cultural and anthropological considerations. In common IE

vocabulary words denoting only two seasons are widespread in all the territory³¹: the word for spring (**wesr-* or similar) and the word for winter (different derivations from root **ǵheim-*)³². It seems, then, that the Indo-Europeans recognized only a temperate season (non-winter) and a cold season (winter), and this fact is perhaps a useful reason for concluding that they inhabited a northern land. Indo-European populations, which emigrated to southern regions with a warmer climate, substituted for this division one having three seasons: spring, summer, winter. The word for 'summer' in Greek and Latin (i.e., in the languages of populations that settled in regions with a Mediterranean climate) is created from Indo-European roots and it has a close relationship with the roots meaning 'warm, hot', but it results from independent innovations.³³ In the most archaic Greek texts the year is divided into three seasons: spring, summer, winter. We do not find any trace of a division of the year into four seasons before Alkman and Euripides, and the change from three to four seasons is probably attributable to the progress in astronomical knowledge; a division grounded on solstices and equinoxes substituted the earlier division, which was more functional to an agricultural cycle. In Latin the borrowed character of *autumnus* indicates that the Latins learned to divide a year into four seasons from another civilization, perhaps from the Etruscans; these considerations help us to understand the Armenian situation too. In Armenian the division into four seasons seems to be old. We can provide convincing evidence for this statement if we examine the Armenian word for spring *garun*. The origin of the first portion of the word is clear: *gar-* comes from **wesr-* with regular phonetical changes; the addition of *-un* is attributable to analogy of *ashun*: in the same way the word for summer *amān* was influenced by the name for winter *jmeṛn*,³⁴ and this fact proves that the Armenians conceived a close relation between the two temperate seasons and a difference between these and the extreme ones.

ՀԱՏԱՆԵՄ HATANEM 'I CUT'

In his *Armenische Grammatik* Hübschmann rejects the connection of *hatanem* with Ossetic *fādun* 'to cleave, to break': according to Hübschmann the Ossetic word is presumably connected with some Iranian words going back to other IE roots,³⁵ whereas the Armenian word seems to point to an IE root like **pad-*.³⁶ I think that it is possible to propose a different etymology for this important and productive group of words.

The point of departure is naturally *hat*, the primary meaning of which is probably 'wheat, corn'; we have to consider the successive,

and perhaps more usual, meaning of 'cut, section, piece, fragment' as a secondary evolution from the primitive one through an intermediate step, 'grain', which appears in several expressions like Համ ցորեան *hat ts'orean*, Համ խաղողոյ *hat khaghoghoy*; we find an identical evolution, for example, in the Italian word *grano*,³⁷ rather in its derivation *granello* (*granello di sabbia, di grandine*, etc.).³⁸ Since in Armenian *h-* is sometimes added to roots that originally began with a vowel (e.g. *hot* 'smell' < **od-*, *haw* 'grandfather' < **awo-*, *haw* 'bird' < **awi-*, *hum* 'harsh' < **ōmo-*),³⁹ we have to assume as originary for this group the form without *h-* which occurs in compounds like *z-atanem* 'I cut' or *lezu-at* '(a man who has) tongue cut'. Therefore it is possible to suppose a connection between *at-* and Lat. *ador adoris*, a technical word of the Latin agricultural vocabulary which means 'a kind of corn, spelt'. Some scholars proposed a very improbable connection of *ador* with Gr. *athēr*, but the obscurity of the formation of *athēr*, the uncertainty of the relationship between *athēr* and other Gr. words (like *ánthos*), and the meaning itself of *athēr* do not permit from the semantical point of view a satisfactory comparison with *ador*, because the fundamental meaning of the Greek word is one of 'point, something sharpened'. The most recent etymological dictionaries of Greek are very prudent, concluding simply with a declaration of unknown etymology; in short the connection between *ador* and *athēr* has been at present rejected.

More probably it is a connection between *ador* and the family of Germanic words to which belong Goth. *atisk*, OHGerm. *ezzesc*, and their family. Goth. *atisk*, which is found only in the expression *pairh atisk*, which translates Gr. *dià (tōn) sporimōn*,⁴⁰ is semantically not too far from *ador*. If the relationship with *ador*, accepted by Walde-Pokorny and Pokorny, is correct, we are allowed to pose an IE root **ad-* 'grain', which can explain the Armenian word too. The Latin word is an *-s*-stem, even if the details of the formation are not regular; the *-o-* of the stem is generally short, although the grammarians say that it may sometimes be lengthened and that only a long *-ō-* appears in the derivated adjective *adōreus* 'wheaten'. If Goth. *atisk* goes back to **ades-go-* and the vowel in the Latin declension was originally short, we can start from a neuter stem **ades-* with regular apophony in the Nom. Sing. **ados-*; other neuter *-s*-stems have in Latin the evolution we find in *funus funeris* or in *tempus temporis*, but the rare and technical character of *ador* justifies the anomalous evolution of the declension. From an early **adus aderis* through different and successive passages we have at first **adus adoris* (like *tempus temporis*), thence **ador adoris* (with *-or* in the Nom. Sing. owing to analogy of oblique cases: however uncommon, such an evolution is

not at all unique; we find similar developments in other ancient *-s*-stems like *aequor aequoris* and *arbor arboris*), and, finally, in *ador adōris* the lengthening of the suffixal syllable completes a full leveling of this ancient neuter word to masculine and feminine *-s*-stems like *algor algōris*. In Armenian there are no *-s*-stems; the identity of ending in the Nom. Sing. produced a general arrangement of the originary *-s*-stems into the *-o*-stems declension: IE **ĝenos ĝenes^ebs* (Sanskrit. *janas janasas*, Gr. *génos géneos*, Lat. *genus generis*) is represented in Armenian by the *-o*-stem *tsin tsnoy*; therefore the passage from *-s*-stems to Arm. *-o*-stem for *hat hatoy* is coherent with the general tendency.

A commonly accepted etymology of Tocharian *āti* 'grass' connects this word with Lat. *ador* and Goth. *atisk*.⁴¹ Pedersen⁴² rejected such a view, supposing instead a connection within the Tocharian word and Turkish *ot* 'grass'. I am not able to decide in a satisfactory manner about this question, which is of irrelevant importance for our matter, but, even if the meaning 'grass' seems to be different and far from the one recognizable in other derivations from root *ad*, the existence in Armenian of an alternative *-i*-stem *hat hati* suggests that we not yet consider definitively closed the question about the Toch. word.

𐰽𐰺𐰍 GIN 'PRICE'

Relationship of *gin* with Sanskrit. *vasnám* and Latin *vēnum* is well known, but, whereas the Indian and Latin words go back to an IE form **wesnom*, to explain *gin*, scholars point to the IE form with long degree **wēsnom*.⁴³ This assumption is supported by two considerations: on one hand the loss of *s* in the consonant groups *sn*, *sm* occurred when the sound change *e* > *i* was already accomplished; on the other hand Greek forms like *ónos onē* allow us to suppose the existence of forms with long degree in the IE root,⁴⁴ even if there is no direct evidence in other languages for the form **wēsnom*. I think that neither the first nor the second consideration has a conclusive value and thus we are not obliged to suppose a form with long degree to explain the origin of *gin*.

With regard to the Greek forms, the development from **wosnā* to *onē* is surely unusual, but it is not necessary to suppose a form with *-ō-*; the Aeolian form *ónna* shows that in Greek, too, we have to pose an originary form with normal degree, a compensative lengthening with *ō* instead of *ou* being rare but not at all isolated, since we find a similar development in *ômos* from **omso-* and perhaps in the Homeric form *Diónysos* (for *Diónysos* or *Diónnysos*) from **Diwosnysos*.⁴⁵ There-

fore, the most recent grammars and vocabularies judge the assumption of a form with long degree for *ōnē* unlikely.

With regard to Armenian, based on examples like *mis* 'meat' < **memso-* or *us* 'shoulder' < **omso-*, scholars are inclined to suppose a relative chronology of the sound changes as follows:

1. *e* > *i* and *o* > *u* before *n*.
2. *ens*, *ems*, *ons*, *oms* > *is*, *us*.
3. *esn*, *esm*, *osn*, *osm* > *en*, *em*, *on*, *om*.

The third passage is supported by examples like *z-genum* 'i dress' < **wesnumi* or *em* 'I am' < **esmi* (I do not know examples of *osn*, *osm* > *on*, *om*). But at least in another case we have to do with a development *osm* > *um*: I refer to the dative ending *-um* in the pronominal inflection, which must be explained only from **-osm*: cf. *um* 'whom?', *imum* 'to my' etc. and the ordinary datives or instrumentals Goth. *þamma* 'him', OSl. *tomŭ*, Lith. *támui* < **tosm-* (Sansk. *tasmai* may have an ancient *-o-* or an ancient *-e-*).

A development *osm* > *um* is absolutely parallel to one *esn* > *in*. The existence of a form like *z-genum* on one hand and of *gin* on the other hand shows that Armenian had two different evolutions of vowels before *sn*, *sm*. An important paper of the illustrious scholar W. Winter presents a collection of a considerable number of examples to demonstrate the existence of early dialectal varieties in classical Armenian⁴⁶; in many cases the varieties of results reflect different regional evolutions of the same phoneme (or phoneme group), which in a former period was probably realized as unique in all the territory (e.g., *ardewk* 'besides *ardeok*'), but I think that in other cases the variety is the consequence of the historical and cultural events which led to the formation of the Armenian language.⁴⁷ As in Greek we have *ōnē* beside *ónna* or *eimí* beside *émmi* (the first with loss of *s* and subsequent compensative lengthening of vowel, the second with assimilation of sibilant to nasal), so in Armenian the twofold exit of *sn* in *gin* (with the same loss of *s* as in *ōnē*) and *z-genum* (for which we are obliged to presume an intermediate step with *-nn-* **zgennum*⁴⁸) persuades us to consider the Armenian as resulting from the encounter and the amalgam of different linguistical currents. Historical linguistics thus shows how great is the complexity of events to which the formation of Armenian is attributable. No other science or knowledge allows us to rejoin or perceive these events.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adjarian Հր. Ահաւոյան. *Հայերէն արմատական բառարան* (*Etymological Dictionary of Armenian*). Erevan 1926-1937.
- Benveniste É. Benveniste. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. 5th ed. Paris, 1984.
- Buck C. D. Buck. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago, 1949.
- Cardona G. R. Cardona. *Armeno e lingue caucasiche: un bilancio*. In E. Campanile, ed. *Problemi di sostrato nelle lingue indoeuropee*. Pisa, 1983. Pp. 37-75.
- Ciakciak M. Ciakciak. *Dizionario armeno-italiano*. Venice, 1837.
- CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin 1863.
- De Vries J. De Vries. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden, 1977.
- Dumézil G. Dumézil. "Notes sur quelques tournures et formes participiales de l'arménien," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 39 (1938), 93-102.
- Ernout-Meillet A. Ernout and A. Meillet. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4th ed. Paris, 1972.
- Feist S. Feist. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache*. 3rd ed. Leiden, 1939.
- Frisk H. J. Frisk. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1954-1973.
- Greppin J. A. C. Greppin. *Classical Armenian Nominal Suffixes: A Historical Study*. Vienna, 1975.
- Hiltbrunner O. Hiltbrunner, ed.. *Bibliographie zur lateinischen Wortforschung*. Bern and Stuttgart, 1985.
- Hübschmann H. Hübschmann. *Armenische Grammatik*. I, *Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig, 1897.
- Karst J. Karst. *Geschichte der armenischen Philologie*. Heidelberg, 1930.
- Laroche É. Laroche. "Études lexicales et étymologiques sur le hittite," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 58 (1963), 59-80.
- Lehmann W. P. Lehmann. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, 1986.
- Mann E. S. Mann. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg, 1984-1987.
- Meillet 1920 A. Meillet. "Les adjectifs arméniens en -un," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 22 (1920), 21-22.
- Meillet 1928 A. Meillet. "Les noms du type t'rch'un," *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 8 (1928), 1-6.
- Meillet 1936 A. Meillet. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*. 2nd ed. Vienna, 1936.
- ML W. Meyer-Lübke. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 5th ed. Heidelberg, 1975. The references are to items.
- Morani M. Morani. "In margine a una concordanza greco-armena," *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 66 (1981), 1-15.
- Patrubány L. van Patrubány. "Zum armenischen Wortforschung," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 14 (1903). 54-60.
- Pedersen 1941 H. Pedersen. *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. Copenhagen, 1938.
- Pedersen 1982 H. Pedersen. *Kleine Schriften zum Armenischen*, hsg. von R. Schmitt. Hildesheim and New York, 1982.
- Pisani 1944 V. Pisani. "Armenische Studien," *Zeitschrift für vergleichenden Sprachforschung* 68 (1944), 157-178.
- Pisani 1964 V. Pisani. *Le lingue dell'Italia antica oltre il latino*. 2nd ed. Turin, 1964.
- Pokorny J. Pokorny. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern, 1959.
- Scheftelowitz I. Scheftelowitz. "Die verbalen und nominalen sk- und sk-Stämmen im

- Arischen und Armenischen," *Zeitschrift für Indo-Iranistik* 6 (1928), 92-125.
- Schmitt R. Schmitt. *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*. Innsbruck, 1981.
- Schwyzer E. Schwyzer. *Griechische Grammatik*. 2nd. ed. Vol. I. Munich, 1939.
- Solta R. Solta. *Die Stellung des Armenisches im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vienna, 1960.
- Tabulae Iguvinae* G. Devoto, ed. *Tabulae Iguvinae*, 2nd ed. Rome, 1940.
- Toporov V. N. Toporov. *Prusskij Jazyk, Slovar'*. Vol. I. Moscow, 1975.
- Vasmer M. Vasmer. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1950-1958.
- Walde-Hofmann A. Walde and J. B. Hofmann. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1938-1956.
- Walde-Pokorny A. Walde and J. Pokorny. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Berlin and Leipzig, 1930-1932.
- Weitenberg J. J. S. Weitenberg. "Additional h-, initial y- and Indo-European y- in Armenian." In M. Leroy and F. Mawet, eds. *La place de l'arménien dans les langues indo-européennes*. Louvain, 1986. Pp. 90-101.
- Winter W. Winter. "Traces of Early Dialectal Diversity in Old Armenian." In H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, eds. *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1966. Pp. 201-211.

NOTES

1. Full discussion and further bibliography in Adjarian I:404-405, Solta, pp. 284-285.
2. Hübschmann, p. 433 ("Arm. *ashun* 'Herbst' kann nicht zu got. *azans*, ksl. *jesenī*, preuss. *assanis* 'Herbst' gehören").
3. Feist, pp. 58-59; Lehmann, p. 45.
4. Vasmer, II:281 with further bibliography.
5. Toporov, pp. 130-131 (the unclear initial *a-* is perhaps due to dissimilation from **esanis*: or is *assanis* a loanword from a Germanic language?).
6. The contraction from **op-osarā* is supported by the Dorian form *apāra*. See Frisk, II:408.
7. Walde-Pokorny, I:161; Pokorny, p. 343; Benveniste, p. 19. The originary meaning of the root is uncertain: since some Germanic derivations mean 'harvest' and others mean 'wage-earner' (e.g., ON, *önn* 'harvest', OHGerm. *aran*, *arn* 'harvest', OE *earnian* 'to earn', Goth. *asneis* 'a wage-earner' etc.), it is impossible to decide whether the notion 'harvest' or 'harvest time' is older than the meaning 'end of summer', which could derive from it, or whether the meaning of 'end of summer' is the primary one. According to Lehmann (p. 45) "Gmc. meaning 'harvest' reflects remodeling of designations for seasons." Further discussion and bibliography by the quoted etymological dictionaries, above all by Feist and Toporov.
8. Scheftelowitz, p. 122.
9. P. 285 ("bei diesem Wort ist keine Sicherheit zu erlangen").
10. Scheftelowitz tries to prove that **ske*, *ski* become *sh* in Armenian, but the examples he quotes are very doubtful: *gēsh* is borrowed from Iranian; for *shuk'* different explanations are at present preferred (Pokorny, p. 594); *gorsh*, *t'arsham*, *arshaw* show the regular result of an early **rs*, not **sk*; the etymology of *shegh* is unsure and the relationship of this word with *chegh* is obscure (Frisk, II:745; Solta, pp. 350-351, with further bibliography). Only *shand* (*shant'*) remains, which can be connected with the root **skent* (Walde-Hofmann, II:495; Pokorny, p. 917), and *shert* (Pokorny, p. 919). Both etymologies are very uncertain and, even if the explanation is correct, we are

probably dealing with an irregular evolution which seems to occur only in the beginning of the word.

11. Cf. Walde-Hofmann, II:771 (with further bibliography); Schmitt, p. 179; Solta, pp. 296-297; Walde-Pokorny, I:311 and Pokorny, p. 1173. The connection with Lat. *vesper*, Gr. *hespéra*, Lith. *vākaraš*, OSL. *večerū* is probable, but the details are ambiguous.

12. Pisani 1944, p. 173.

13. From **sk(h)ei-d-* we have in Armenian only the derivation *ts'tim* (Walde-Pokorny, II:541; Pokorny, p. 920, etc.).

14. The Patrubány (p. 55) hypothesis which explains *ashun* as stemming from **ā-ki-kuwont-* (with *ā-* and a derivation from the root *kw-* 'to swell' with reduplication), must be discarded. Assumption that in Armenian *k k* becomes *sh* is groundless.

15. For instance, Mann quotes within the derivations of this root Ombrian *puste asiane*, a hapax which is found in *Tabulae Iguvinae*, I a 25. Mann translated these words, the meaning of which is altogether obscure, as 'every autumn'. I do not know where Mann found such interpretation, but I believe that it would be very hard to defend it. Devoto translated this passage 'sulla parte posteriore dell'altare' and Pisani 1964, p. 165, supposing an error in the transmitted text (*asiane* instead of *arsiane*), proposed 'postico in sacrario'.

16. Cf. Walde-Hofmann, I:87; Ernout-Meillet, p. 61. In the recent Hiltbrunner's critical bibliography *autumnus* is not treated.

17. So, e.g., *hýmnos*, *amphikélymnos*, *díktamnon*, *lémna*, etc. Cf. Schwyzler, p. 524.

18. E.g., *laucane* and *lacane*.

19. Cf. Mess. *basta* : Gr. *Baýsta*; Alb. *agój* < **aug-* (cf. Greek *augé*) ; *thanj* < **sausnyō* 'I dry' (Pokorny, pp. 880-881), etc.

20. So, *Fastina* for *Faustina* (CIL, VIII:23496), *Cladius* for *Claudius* (CIL, VI:34925, 37335, etc.).

21. It. *ascoltare*, Fr. *écouter*, Rum. *asculta*, OSp. *ascuchar* etc. (ML 802).

22. Rum. *agust*, It. Sp. Port. *agosto*, Fr. *août*, etc. (ML 786).

23. OFr. *aür*, etc. (Fr. *bonheur*, *malheur*) (ML 785).

24. Meillet 1928; Meillet 1936, p. 48; Greppin, pp. 138-139. I do not consider here the productive suffix *-un* of the adjectives (like *sharzhun* 'movable', *azazun* 'dry'), which may have a different origin (Greppin, p. 139, quoting Meillet 1920, pp. 21-22, and Dumézil, pp. 95-96: cf. Indo-Iranian **-āna*).

25. The derivation of *-mn* from **-mno-* (not only from **-mñ*, as supposed Meillet 1936, pp. 48, 79) is suggested by Greppin (pp. 110-111). A derivation from **-mñ* (= Gr. *-mna*) is sure in the case of *sermn* 'seed' etc. For the very productive deverbative suffix *-umn* cf. Greppin, p. 138.

26. Laroche, p. 75 n. 1.

27. Cf. Pokorny, pp. 889-892, which does not quote *himn*. For a very improbable connection of this word with Lat. *sēmen* and Gr. *hlēmi* see Frisk, I:745 with bibliography.

28. A similar alternance between *e* and *i* occurs, e.g., in the pair Lat. *menta* : Gr. *minthē* and perhaps in the pair Lat. *citrus* : Gr. *kédros* (cf. Walde-Hofmann, I:223). For *geghmn* see Adjarian, II:130 and Solta, p. 142. For *vellus* see Ernout-Meillet, p. 718 and Walde-Hofmann, II:741 and 745 (according to some scholars the alternance between *vellus* and *villus* reflects a dialectal variety).

29. See *rota* < **roth-* (Skr. *rátha-*); *catinus* < (Skr. *kathina-*); etc.

30. Karst, p. 17.

31. Except Germanic, which has a different word for winter.

32. See Buck, pp. 1013, 1016.

33. In India, too, the Vedic texts recognized three seasons: in the classical period a year is subdivided into six or seven seasons.

34. See Solta, pp. 282-283.
35. Oss. *fādun* is probably connected with Bal. *patay* 'I cut', and both go back to a root **pat*, whereas Arm. *-t-* can be explained only from IE **d*.
36. Hübschmann, p. 464.
37. Cf. *grano d'uva* 'grape' (exactly as *hat khaghoghoy!*), *a grano a grano* 'one at a time', etc.
38. It is possible to appreciate the semantical evolution of *hat* reading upside down the lemma *hat* in the Armenian vocabulary of Ciakciak: "Tagliamento, taglio, sexione, frammento, pezzo, pezzetto, particella, porzione . . . Grano, granello, frumento".
39. The problem of the initial *h-* in classical Armenian and in its modern dialects has now been discussed by Weitenberg, which shows that *h-* corresponding to zero of classical Armenian in many young dialectal forms represents IE *y*. Weitenberg also provides further bibliography.
40. For further details see Feist, p. 61.
41. See Walde-Pokorny, I:45; Pokorny, p. 3.
42. Pederson 1941: 64.
43. See Hübschmann, p. 433; Schmitt, pp. 51, 66, 69; Adjarian, II:195; Solta, p. 295; Pedersen 1982, p. 192. A different (but no better) explanation is proposed by Cardona, pp 40-41, which considers *gin* as a loanword from Sumerian GIN 'name of a measure; shekel' (cf. Akkad. *ginû* 'standard (said of weight)').
44. Schmitt, p. 69; Pedersen 1982, p. 192.
45. Cf. Schwyzler, p. 283; Frisk, II:1149-1150, but *Diónysos* can be due to a wrong transcription of an earlier *DIONYSOS*, *o* being the only sign used for *o*, *ō*, *ou*.
46. Winter, pp. 201-211.
47. I already expressed my views about Winter's conclusions in a paper published in 1981 (Morani, pp. 11-15).
48. Obviously we have to consider the development from **wesnumi* to **zgennun* later than the evolution **e* > *i* before nasal.